

REMARKS

Claims 1-49 and 51-75 have been cancelled. Claim 50 has been amended to incorporate base claim 36 and other intervening claims from which claim 50 depends. Support for the amendments made to the claims are provided throughout the specification and claims. Changes made in this amendment are merely to place objected claim 50 into proper independent format. Applicants reserve the right to file a continuation or divisional application claiming the subject matter of cancelled or withdrawn claims. No new matter or new issues of patentability are introduced by this amendment.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 36-48, 51-54, 58, 59, and 61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunphy, et al. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that the claimed invention is obvious over Dunphy. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, applicants have cancelled claims 1-49 and 51-75 rendering this §103 rejection moot.

Claims 36, 37, 42, 49, 55-60, and 68-75 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunphy as applied to claims 36-48, 51-54, 58, 59, and 61, and further in view of Weber and in view of Harrison. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that the claimed invention is obvious over Dunphy in view of Weber and in view of Harrison. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, applicants have cancelled claims 1-49 and 51-75 rendering this §103 rejection moot.

Claims 58, 59, and 62-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunphy as applied to claims 36-48, 51-54, 58, 59, and 61, and further in view of Wainwright. Applicants respectfully disagree with this ground of rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, applicants have cancelled claims 1-49 and 51-75 rendering this §103 rejection moot.

Claim 67 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunphy as applied to claims 36-48, 51-54, 58, 59, and 61, and further in view of Wainwright as applied to claims 58, 59, and 62-66, and further in view of Weber and in view of Harrison. Applicants respectfully disagree with this ground of rejection. However, in order to expedite

prosecution of the present application, applicants have cancelled claims 1-49 and 51-75 rendering this §103 rejection moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 50 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. In order to expedite allowance of this application, claim 50 has been amended to include all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims, as suggested by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

There being no other outstanding issues in this case, allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested. Early and favorable action by the Examiner is earnestly solicited.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the timely consideration of this amendment under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 2629-4005US1.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

By:


Evelyn M. Kwon
Registration No. 54,246

Dated: December 15, 2004

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154-0053
(212) 758-4800 Telephone
(212) 751-6849 Facsimile